

REMARKS

Claims 31-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 31-35 are amended and claims 1-30 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 1-15, 17-20 and 31-33

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15, 17-20 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,809 to Singhal et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are canceled and thus the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Claims 31-33 are not anticipated by Singhal. Singhal does not disclose a drive method of an electro-optic device that includes "bringing at least one of the subfields in which a pertinent pixel is to be brought into a transmissive state and which are only concentrated in a first half of the pertinent field on the basis of multi-bit display data," as recited in independent claim 31.

Instead, Singhal merely discloses a controller that generates 16 gray shades by a 4-frame FRC cycle using modulated row periods. See, e.g., Singhal, col. 6, lines 29-30 and Fig. 6. That is, the placement of the transmissive state and non-transmitting condition is random.

In contrast, the subfields of the transmissive state of the above-identified application are only concentrated in a first half of the pertinent field, and at least one of the subfields of the transmissive state is brought into a non-transmitting condition. That is, by this claimed method, the number of gradations is increased. Nowhere does Singhal disclose this feature.

Thus, claim 31, is patentable over Singhal. Further, claims 32 and 33, which depend from claim 31 are patentable over Singhal for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Claim 6

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Singhal. Claim 6 is canceled, and thus the rejection of this claim is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. Claims 16, 22-24, 26-28, 30 and 34-36

The Office Action rejects claims 16, 22-24, 26-28, 30 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Singhal in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,712,652 to Sato et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16, 22-24, 26-28 and 30 are canceled, and thus the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Claims 34-36 would not have been rendered obvious by Singhal in view of Sato. Singhal does not disclose a drive circuit that includes a control device that "performs control on the basis of the multi-bit display data so that at least one of the subfields in which a pertinent pixel is to be brought into the transmissive state and which are only concentrated in a first half of the pertinent field on the basis of the multi-bit display data, may be brought into a non-transmitting condition for displaying a gradation per pixel on the basis of the multi-bit display data," as recited in independent claim 34. Further, Singhal does not disclose an electro-optic device that includes a control device that "controls a data line drive circuit in accordance with a multi-bit display data so that pulse signals for bringing the respective pixels into transmissive states are only concentrated in a first half of the field, and that at least one of the pulse signals which bring the pixels into the transmissive states and which are only

concentrated in the first half of the field on the basis of the multi-bit display data, may be brought into non-transmitting condition in accordance with the multi-bit display data for displaying a gradation per pixel," as recited in independent claim 35.

That is, as discussed above, by only concentrating the subfields of the transmissive state in a first half of the pertinent field, and at least one of the subfields of the transmissive state being brought into a non-transmitting condition, the number of gradations is increased.

In contrast, as discussed above, in Singhal, the placement of the transmissive state and non-transmitting condition is random.

Further, Sato does not cure the deficiency discussed above. Sato is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of the disposition of the pixel electrodes.

Thus, claims 34 and 35 are patentable over Singhal and Sato. Further, claim 36, which depends from claim 35, is also patentable over Singhal in view of Sato for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 35, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

D. Claim 21

The Office Action rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Singhal in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,037,920 to Mizutome et al. Claim 21 is canceled, and thus the rejection of this claim is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

E. Claims 25 and 29

The Office Action rejects claims 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Singhal in view of Sato and further in view of Mizutome. Claims 25 and 29 are canceled and thus the rejection of these claims is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/rle

Date: August 26, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--